

Question 2

1. I'd like to know more about why the 5 Corners reservoir repair costs have increased by approx. \$1m. Phil mentioned last night the numbers in the packet didn't match because of the cost escalation, but I didn't hear what drove the escalation. That's a very significant difference.

- 5 corners reservoir project cost increase breakdown:
- Approximately \$330,000 is escalation for coating removal and replacement
- Approximately \$230,000 is utility piping help improve the overall operation of the tanks.
- Approximately \$30,000 in safety improvements (railings, ladders, man-ways, etc.)
- 25% contingency for the additional items above since we are only in 50% design
- 30% construction inspection/admin/testing/permitting/etc. for the total cost of all items above

$$\$330,000 + \$230,000 + \$30,000 = \$590,000 \times 1.25 \times 1.30 = \$958,750$$

2. DP 90: 2018 cap cost for the Dayton St. lift station is \$970. Phil mentioned we were in line for some county grant money to defray some of this cost. However, he didn't say anything about potential state grant dollars. Since the flooding issue directly involves SR 104, why isn't the state contributing?

The City has budgeted \$970,000 in Stormwater rate revenue for the construction of this project. Additional Funds required to be able to go to bid on this project are between \$950,000 and \$1,000,000). The plan to acquire these funds includes:

- County loan - \$500,000 (secured)
- FEMA Grant - \$500,000 (requested – unsecured)

The decision on the FEMA Grant has been delayed due to recent weather and fire disasters around the country. We were told our grant had a great chance, but as in all things it is not yet 100% certain.

Your question regarding state participation is a good one. The management of stormwater on state highways is a City responsibility under State law for cities with a population of 22,500 people or more. That doesn't mean we cannot ask for assistance. We did that perhaps four years ago by asking them to address specific issues related to the culverts under SR-104 that discharge into the Marsh. They did not believe these culverts were in danger of failure at that time and have since not made any progress on replacing them or working with us to design replacements. I recall they did move them up on their priority list for replacement but have not gotten close to the top of that list yet. We will continue to explore ways they could partner with us on this project.

3. Pavement preservation: are the findings from the recent Pavement Condition Inventory incorporated into the 2018 funding needs? If not, might we see a reprioritization or a budget amendment when those findings are integrated?

We did not have the draft IMS Pavement Rating Study when we developed a list of candidate paving projects for 2018. Once the report was available we checked our existing list (developed by our in-house street maintenance staff and our Engineering Division) against the priorities presented in the IMS report. We considered one possible change to the 2018 recommendations but ultimately decided to keep our list as it was for next year. We are hoping to be able to continue to use the Snohomish County paving contract in 2018. It has been a very cost-effective option for Edmonds and we are, by far apparently, the largest City they have been providing services to. They have indicated a desire to reduce our dependence on them for this work. These discussions are on-going.

Question 2

4. DP 36: What is the current LOS for the 76th and 220th St. intersection and is the LOS degrading? What LOS improvement will this investment achieve?
The existing LOS at this intersection is LOS D (intersection delay = 35 seconds). Based on future traffic growth, the projected LOS is F in 2035 (intersection delay = 93 seconds), which is the reason why this project is identified in **2015 Transportation Plan** as a concurrency project. The improvements would modify the LOS to LOS B (intersection delay = 20 seconds) and LOD D in 2035 (intersection delay = 44 seconds).
5. P.151 of the 10/24 Council packet (summary of PW Administration expenses): What is driving the 31% Interfund Rental increase for 2018?
This is driven almost entirely by our allocated share of the new telephone system purchased by the IT cost center in the Finance Department Budget.
6. DPs 32 and 33: Why no phone/misc expense shown for the Asst. Engineer, as is shown for the Capital Projects Manager? Or are the DP 32 costs for phone/misc expressed as "other"? If the latter, why don't we use "other" as the standard category across all departments for miscellaneous expenses associated with an FTE?
I think the simple answer to this question is that, for no apparent reason, I summarized them differently in the PowerPoint presentation. I would be happy to do them the same way (probably as just "miscellaneous") in future presentations. The Decision Packages themselves (#s 32 and 33 in the submitted budget) do detail the additional costs for these positions beyond salaries and benefits.
7. DP 68: Please provide a breakdown of items included in the \$20k traffic calming program (e.g., \$x for pole-mounted radar signs, \$y for speed bumps, etc)
In 2018, the City would anticipate at least half of the \$20,000 requested would go toward radar feedback technology. This equipment is getting more capable and flexible each year. That would leave approximately \$10,000 to address other traffic calming approaches where applicable.
8. P. 135 of PW budget: "Miscellaneous" expense is fairly flat for 2016 and 2017. Why the 52% increase in 2018?
The "miscellaneous" numbers referred to are \$23,000 in the 2017 budget and \$41,500 proposed in the 2018 Engineering Division budgets, respectively. This difference of \$18,500 is related to decision packages 30 through 35. DP30 is \$5,000 for the ORCA card program. I also mentioned that this number needed to be adjusted to \$10,000 during my presentation. I am happy to answer any questions about that if you would like to know more. DP31 was for \$2,000 to continue the incentives contained in the City's Commute Trip Reduction Program. DP32, DP33, and DP34 are the three new positions requested in Engineering. That amounts to \$4,000 each for DP32 and DP33 and \$3,500 for DP34. These amounts would provide for needed furniture, office equipment, and other initial expenses for a new hire.
 $5k + 2k + 4k + 4k + 3.5k = \$18.5k$ = the difference between 2017 and 2018
9. P. 139 of PW budget: What investment does the Facility Condition Inventory call for re: the B&G club building?
The Boy and Girls Club investment from the Facility Condition Index report is estimated at \$35,500 on average over the next 5 years to handle current deficiencies. It seems unlikely at this point a decision would be made to spend at that level on this building considering that plans are being made to raise money for a new Boys and Girls Club as part of the new Park development at Civic Field.

Question 2

10. p. 145 of PW budget: why no depreciation expense shown for 2017 or 2018, but is shown for 2016?

We do not budget for depreciation. However, 2016 shows the depreciation amount so that the Beginning Balance + revenues - expenses will = Ending Balance as shown in the CAFR. This is a year-end close out issue and not part of the current year active budget or next year's proposed budget.

11. p. 162 of PW budget: narrative mentions REET 1 dollars cover a number of items, including the library roof construction. I presume this means necessary repairs to the library roof. However, I don't see anything in the 2018 budget for library roof repairs. Are we planning to defer that work until 2019?

Your question deals with the Library membrane roof issues? Correct? If so, yes, we are looking to begin project development for that in 2019.

On the off chance you were wanting to know about the status of the adjacent Frances Anderson roof project we are waiting to see if the Legislature passes a capital budget during their next session. We had \$371,000 (as I recall) on the approved project list for that roof before they adjourned last session. Should that package be approved we will immediately move forward on re-roofing the building.

12. ADA curb ramp/sidewalk issue: the cost to comply with federal requirements is mind-boggling. There are certain streets in Edmonds that are very steep (Walnut between 7th and 9th, for instance), where it is virtually impossible (and even dangerous) for a person in a wheelchair to go up or down the sidewalk (even if they had someone helping). In those areas, if we have functional sidewalks and curb ramps already, it doesn't make sense to me our city would be required to upgrade those ramps/sidewalks to comply with an updated regulation. I'm sure other cities have steep hills like ours where this is the same consideration. Could we ask our federal lobbyist to explore whether we could ask for relief from the new ADA standard where they exist on hills of a grade over a certain percentage? If we could trim out a few curb ramps/sidewalks from the compliance requirement, that would help bring the cost down a little bit.

This can certainly be a frustrating aspect of trying to meet ADA requirements as you point out. If the 8.3% maximum running slope limit cannot be met, the ADA requirement is that ramp length should be extended to at least 15' from the ramp itself at 8.3% before tying into the steeper existing slope. Under those conditions, the curb ramp would then be considered compliant with ADA standards although it may not get a great deal of use by disabled users since the approaches to the ramp, as you stated, may be nearly impossible for a disabled person to use. Curb ramps that fall into this category have been identified in the self-assessment completed as part of ADA Transition Plan.